

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ENOMA IGBINOVIA,)	3:11-cv-00079-ECR-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	June 22, 2012
)	
JAMES G. COX, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: JENNIFER COTTER REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:

Before the court is defendants' Motion to Strike "Plaintiff's Motion for an Order Compelling Discovery Request, and Plaintiff Opposition to Defendants Summary Judgment Motion and Plaintiff's Cross Motion for Summary Judgement (Dockets #67, #68 and #69)." (Doc. #73.)

Defendants contend that plaintiff's motions, which are combined into one document but separated in the court's docket, are in violation of Local Rule 7-4. Plaintiff has filed a "reply" in response. (Doc. #78.) Therein plaintiff relies on Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 that supposedly allows filing of memoranda dealing with multiple subjects in one document. Plaintiff also submits an argument defendants' motion for summary judgment is premature.

The Court agrees with defendants that plaintiff's combined filings violate Local Rule 7-4 which, absent court approval, limits points and authorities to 30 pages (excluding exhibits). In the instant matter, plaintiff's combined filing totals some 55 pages, exclusive of another 46 pages of exhibits, i.e., pages 56-96 of Doc. #67, followed by another 120 pages of exhibits (labeled as Doc. #67-1). Although it appears plaintiff has sub-labeled his various arguments (motion to compel, opposition and cross motion), the Court has a difficult time discerning which documents support which argument. The absence of a table of contents/table of authorities required by Local Rule 7-4 for briefs longer than 30 pages complicates the problem as well.

Therefore, defendants' motion to strike (Doc. #73) is **GRANTED** and the Clerk shall strike Docs. # 67, 68 and 69 from the Docket.

MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:11-cv-00079-ECR-WGC

Date: June 22, 2012

Page 2

To bring some order to chaos in this matter, if plaintiff wishes to pursue the relief he attempted to seek in Doc. #67 as a motion to compel, he shall file a separate motion on that subject **on or before June 30, 2012**. Assuming plaintiff will proceed to file a separate motion to compel, responsive and/or reply memoranda will be due thereafter as required by the Local Rules. The clerk will calendar a hearing on plaintiff's motion on a date after the deadline for the filing of a reply thereto.

If plaintiff wishes to pursue the relief he attempted to seek in Doc. #69 as a cross motion for summary judgment, he shall file a separate motion on that subject **on or before June 30, 2012**.

However, further proceedings on defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #62) and any potential cross motion for summary judgment are **STAYED** pending resolution of the anticipated filing of the motion to compel. Should plaintiff not file a motion to compel within the time prescribed above, this stay will be lifted and briefing on defendants' motion (Doc. #62) and any potential cross motion for summary judgment shall be reinstated per the Local Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: _____ /s/
Deputy Clerk